

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 7-15 are allowed and that claims 19-27 include allowable subject matter.

Claim 1 has been amended to correct a minor informality. Attached is a marked-up version of the changes by the current amendment. No new matter has been added.

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of each of the rejections and allowance of the application.

Claim Rejections 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-6, 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Motohama et al. (US 5,894,424).

Claim 1 of the present application recites a method that includes storing event signals in a holding circuit and evaluating a device under test (DUT) based on the response signals from the DUT and stored event signals received from the holding circuit.

The Motohama et al. patent discloses an apparatus 1 that includes a memory 2 storing a testing program 3 for testing a device 8. (See column 6, lines 5-21) The testing program 3 is processed by a control unit 4 and an optimization unit 5 and then executed by hardware 6. The testing program 3 includes statements for controlling the hardware 6 and for testing the device 8. The optimization unit 5 detects redundant statements in the program 3 and, therefore, reduces the time necessary to test the device 8. (See abstract)

The Motohama et al. patent does not disclose each and every limitation of claim 1. In particular, the Motohama et al. does not disclose or suggest "storing the event signals in a holding circuit" as recited in claim 1. Instead, according to the Motohama et al. patent, "statements" stored in the memory 2 are used for testing the device 8. (See column 6, lines 10-52) The term "statements," as used in the Motohamam et al. patent, refers to programs or

program steps:

A statement concerning the conditional setting for the hardware 6, a statement concerning the power-on for the hardware 6, a statement concerning the execution of the functional test of the semiconductor 8 and a statement concerning the power-off of the hardware 6 are provided in the mentioned order in the respective programs (3a, 3b, ---). Moreover, a statement concerning the end of the testing program 3 is configured at the end of the testing program. Hereupon, these statements concerning the conditional setting for the hardware 6, are, for example, a statement concerning the value of the power-level, a statement concerning the value of the clock frequency, a statement concerning the value of the electric current.

(See column 6, lines 14, 27) Such “statements” are very different from “signals” as recited in the present claim. Thus, although the Motohama et al. patent stores “statements” in a memory, it does not teach or suggest “storing [] event signals in a holding circuit” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 and dependent claims 5-6 are not anticipated.

Moreover, the Motohama et al. patent does not disclose or suggest evaluating the DUT based on the “response signals from the DUT and stored event signals received from the holding circuit” as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). The Office Action cites a passage in the Motohama et al. patent (column 7, lines 42-60) as being equivalent to the claimed feature. However, that passage simply explains that the apparatus 1 can optimize the execution of the programs for testing the device by eliminating unnecessary statements during execution. The apparatus 1 determines the status of the device 8 as a result of the hardware 6 executing the procedures in the statements (see column 7, lines 33-39) with the result that the “functional tests” of the device 8 are shortened using the procedures of the program. The apparatus 1 of Motohama does not evaluate the DUT based on stored event signals because it does not store event signals received from the memory 2. There is simply no disclosure or suggestion in the Motohama et al. patent of evaluating the DUT based on the “response signals from the DUT and stored event signals received from the holding circuit” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 and dependent claims 5-6 are not anticipated for this additional reason as well.

Applicant : Bradley A. Bloecher
Serial No. : 09/843,606
Filed : April 26, 2001
Page : 4

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-400001 / P10337

Claim 16 recites a system that includes "a holding circuit for receiving the event signals and trigger signals, and for capturing the event signals . . . and a measuring device for evaluating the DUT based on the response signals from the DUT and captured event signals from the holding circuit." Claim 16, as well as dependent claims 17 and 18, should be allowable for at least the reasons discussed above.

Consequently, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection.


Conclusion

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed.

Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/18/02



Samuel Borodach
Reg. No. 38,388

Fish & Richardson P.C.
4350 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 500
San Diego, CA 92122
Telephone: 858-678-5070
Facsimile: 858-678-5099

Applicant : Bradley A. Bloecher
Serial No. : 09/843,606
Filed : April 26, 2001
Page : 5

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-400001 / P10337

Version with markings to show changes made

In the claims:

Claim 1 has been amended as follows:

- 1. (Amended) A method comprising:
- generating event signals;
 - storing the event signals in a holding circuit;
 - producing response signals in a device under test (DUT) in response to the event signals; and
 - evaluating the DUT based on the response signals from the DUT and stored event signals received from the holding circuit [and]. --